REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are now pending in the application. Independent claims 1 and 4 have been amended and new dependent claims 9-12 have been added. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

Claims 1-6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kentish, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,778,417). Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kentish, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,778,417) in view of Iwamoto, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,816,833). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' invention is directed to a sound control system for use in an auditorium or the like. A professional digital mixer is used by a professional to define sets of detailed settings for various types of equipment (e.g., individual microphones, etc.) and store those settings in memory. Then, a user who, for example, rents the auditorium, can employ a private mixer (e.g., simple control surface of the professional mixer) to operate the sound system. When the user turns on the private mixer, the sound processor retrieves the predefined professional settings and employs them to operate the sound system. The user then employs the private mixer to modify the professional settings.

Authorization parameter identifying information assigns the controls of the private mixer for modifying a subset of the settings. Accordingly, the user's modification of the professional settings is restricted. As an example, the user can be prevented from changing the setting of an equalizer if it is not assigned to a control of the private mixer. Thus, the user is allowed to start from a set of useful settings for all of the equipment, obtain a set of private settings by modifying only a predetermined subset of the settings, and operate the sound system by employing the private settings. These private settings can also be sent to the professional mixer for storage in memory as private settings that can be retrieved by the user when needed.

The Examiner relies on Kentish to teach a digital audio mixing console for which some of the controls have predefined functions, while others have user assignable functions (i.e., the user selects a function for a control from a menu). The Examiner equates the claimed "retrieval of stored settings" as Kentish's scanning processor retrieving panel settings in real time from RAM and sending them to the signal processor. The Examiner construes Kentish's mapping of controls to displays, which occurs automatically when the user first manipulates a control as "authorization parameters". However, Kentish is not utilizing authorization parameters because the manipulation of the mixer settings is not restricted.

Kentish, in effect, implements a set of presets or macros that a user can select to quickly set up the mixer to a predefined starting point. A big difference however is that with the Kentish system, the user can then proceed to further adjust any of the starting point parameters—even parameters that affect sophisticated attributes that for the

novice are best left untouched. The user could, for example, make changes to the EQ settings that were preset to match the acoustics of the room, thinking that he or she was "improving" the sound, when in fact those parameters had already been optimized by professional sound engineers. Later, during a live performance, when unwanted acoustic feedback begins to occur—due to the poorly chosen EQ settings—the user typically has no clue as to why feedback is occurring and may proceed to make even further poor setting decisions.

The applicants' invention is designed to avoid this problem by, in effect, locking out certain parameter adjustments made via the simple control unit. This is done by defining an authorization parameter that identifies which parameters the simple control unit is authorized to set among the entire set of available parameters. Thus in the preceding example, the room EQ parameter settings might not be authorized for change via the simple control unit.

In order to more fully distinguish applicants' invention, the independent claims have been amended to more fully recite the function of applicants' authorization parameter to designate which of the parameters the simple control unit is empowered to adjust. Specifically, these claims have been amended to recite that the mixing unit is responsive to authorization parameter identifying information which identifies the parameter that the simple control unit is authorized to set among a plurality of parameters

New dependent claims have also been added. Dependent claims 9 and 10 add the recitation that the predefined authorization parameter identifying information restricts

in advance the parameters that can be set by the simple control unit. Dependent claims 11 and 12 add the recitation that the plural sets of detailed settings are plural sets of predetermined detailed settings information.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 28, 2008

By: /Gregory A. Stobbs/
Gregory A. Stobbs, Reg. No. 28764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600